

REMARKS

Claims 21-25, 27 and 29 are pending in the application. Claims 21 and 25 are independent. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Rejection of Independent Claim 21 and Dependent Claims 22-24

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Han (US 6,007,038) in view of Brown (US 5,872,892). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 21 is patentable over Han in view of Brown for two reasons. First, Brown does not provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the tilt and swivel apparatus of Han so that it is capable of receiving and responding to tilt and swivel commands transmitted from a keyboard. Second, Brown is not "analogous prior art."

(1) Brown Does not Provide a Suggestion or Motivation to Modify Han

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of Han or to combine the teachings of Han with the teachings of Brown. Applicant respectfully submits that no such suggestion or motivation exists.

Why would one of ordinary skill in the art be motivated to modify Han based on the teachings of Brown? The answer is, they would not be so motivated. Why? Because Brown teaches only that one can control movement of a processor controlled device (e.g., a processor controlled robotic arm) using a keyboard, *see Brown, Col. 7, ll. 10-15* ("... signal from the optical detector is transmitted to a processor 121 which controls the manipulator device 10 including first and second motors") (emphasis added); *col 8, ll. 1-2* ("The solenoid valve assembly 124 is itself controlled by the processor 121 of the manipulator device 10."); *and col. 10, ll. 66-67* ("during operation of the manipulator device 10, the processor 121 causes the upper and lower arms 14, 16 to move").

On the other hand, Han is concerned with using a remote control to control the movement of a non-processor controlled device (i.e., a tilt and swivel apparatus for a display monitor). The tilt and swivel apparatus disclosed in Han is simply not processor controlled. That is, nowhere does Han disclose that the tilt and swivel apparatus is interfaced to a

processor such that the processor is capable sending tilt and swivel commands to the apparatus. Because the tilt and swivel apparatus is not processor controlled, the apparatus can not be easily controlled by a keyboard because there is no communication path between the keyboard and the apparatus. In other words, modifying Han based on Brown would require one skilled in the art to interface a processor to the tilt and swivel apparatus. But, such a person skilled in the art would not be motivated to interface a processor to the tilt and swivel apparatus because doing so would greatly increase the cost and complexity of the apparatus. Furthermore, there is nothing in Brown to suggest that the apparatus of Han is somehow deficient or in need of modification. Accordingly, Brown simply does not provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the apparatus of Han so that the apparatus is interfaced with a processor. Therefore, the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

Moreover, if it is obvious to use a keyboard to control the tilt and swivel apparatus disclosed in Han then why did not Han disclose such a feature? If, as the Office alleges, it is obvious to use a keyboard to control the tilt and swivel apparatus, then one would expect Han to have disclosed such a feature. But Han disclosed no such feature. This is further evidence that the Office's rejection lacks merit.

The Office contends that "the idea of using a computer keyboard to control mechanical movement of a computer-controlled [i.e., processor controlled] system is not unique." Applicant fully agrees with the Office on this point. However, the Office appears to take the position that the tilt and swivel apparatus disclosed in Han is a "computer-controlled" device. This is not true. As discussed above, the tilt and swivel apparatus disclosed in Han is not a computer (i.e., processor) controlled device. Accordingly, the Office's obviousness rejection is based on a faulty premise.

The Office also contends that "keyboards are the standard input devices of computer systems." Again, Applicant fully agrees with the Office on this point. However, as discussed above, the tilt and swivel apparatus is not a "computer system." The tilt and swivel apparatus disclosed in Han does not include a computer processor nor is it interfaced to a computer processor; thus it is not a computer system. Consequently, the fact that keyboards are the standard input devices of computer systems is completely irrelevant.

While it may be true that the tilt and swivel apparatus is connected to a display that is connected to the video output of a processor that is connected to a keyboard, it remains true that the tilt and swivel apparatus itself is in no way interfaced to the processor. Accordingly, because the tilt and swivel apparatus disclosed in Han is in no way interfaced to the processor, it is also not interfaced with the keyboard. Thus, the tilt and swivel apparatus disclosed in Han is completely different than the robotic arm disclosed in Brown because the robotic arm is interfaced to a processor, whereas the tilt and swivel apparatus is not. Accordingly, Brown does not provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the tilt and swivel apparatus disclosed in Han to be controlled by a keyboard. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

(2) Brown is not "Analogous Art"

In order to be "analogous art" a reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicant was concerned. The Office contends that Brown is "reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicant was concerned." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The particular problem faced by the Applicant was how to improve a computer display device. See para [0006] ("there remains a need in the art for improvements in computer display devices"). Brown is directed to "robotic manipulator devices for effecting motion of associated tooling." *Col. 1, ll. 15-17*. Because Brown is directed to robotic manipulator devices for effecting motion of associated tooling, Brown is not a reference that logically would have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering the problem of how to improve a computer display device. Why would an inventor faced with the problem of how to improve a computer display device turn to a reference that is directed to robotic manipulator devices for effecting motion of associated tooling? The answer is that such an inventor would not turn to such a reference.

Moreover, the subject matter disclosed in Brown is not relevant to the particular problem of how to improve a computer display device. As discussed above, Brown is concerned with controlling a processor controlled device. As further discussed above, a conventional computer display device is not processor controlled. Thus, unless one uses

hindsight, the teachings of Brown are not relevant to the particular problem faced by the inventor.

Accordingly, Brown is not reasonably pertinent to the problem of how to improve a computer display device. For this additional, independent reason, the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims 22-24, these claims depend from claim 21. Thus, claims 22-24 are allowable for at least the same reasons give above with respect to claim 21.


Rejection of Independent Claim 25 and Dependent claims 27 and 29

Independent claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Han (US 6,007,038) in view of Moller (US 6,411,934). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The above remarks for claim 21 apply to claim 25 because, like claim 21, claim 25 requires a computer display device comprising a user interface wherein the “user interface ... comprises a module configured to (1) receive user commands from said keyboard and (2) control said tilt drive and said swivel drive in accordance with the commands received from the keyboard.” Accordingly, claim 25, and claims 27 and 29 that depend therefrom, are patentable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Brian Rosenbloom, Registration No.: 41,276				
SIGNATURE				DATE	11/30/05
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031